

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE





UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/640,513	08/17/2000	David Lars Ehnebuske	AUS9-2000-0371-US1	6303
7	590 06/20/2003			
Duke W Yee			EXAMINER	
Carstens Yee & Cahoon LLP P O Box 802334			CARLSON, JEFFREY D	
Dallas, TX 75	2360		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
		3622		
			DATE MAILED: 06/20/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

· -	4					
•/		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	SSI - Andion Comments	09/640,513	EHNEBUSKE ET AL.			
0	ffice Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit \			
		Jeffrey D. Carlson	3622			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status						
1)□ Res	ponsive to communication(s) filed on	_·				
2a)☐ This	s action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ Th	is action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Clain	n(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application	1.				
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5)☐ Clain	n(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-21</u> is/are rejected.						
7)☐ Clain	7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8)☐ Clain	8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.						
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.						
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120						
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).						
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:						
1.	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.					
2.	Certified copies of the priority document					
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).						
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received. 15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.						
Attachment(s)		2/14 P.	61			
2) Notice of Dra 3) Information	ferences Cited (PTO-892) aftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>1</u>	5) Notice of Informal	ry (PTO-413) Paper No(s) Patent Application (PTO-152)			
U.S. Patent and Trademark PTO-326 (Rev. 04-0		tion Summary	Part of Paper No. 3			

Art Unit: 3622

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

1. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

- 2. Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.
 - Claims 1, 16 and 21 do not provide a useful and tangible result. Neither the steps that define objects nor the means or instructions for defining objects achieve a useful and tangible result.
 - Claims 1 and 10, fail to present an invention within the "technological arts."

As an initial matter, the United States Constitution under Art. I, §8, cl. 8 gave

Congress the power to "[p]romote the progress of science and useful arts, by securing
for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings
and discoveries". In carrying out this power, Congress authorized under 35 U.S.C.
§101 a grant of a patent to "[w]hoever invents or discovers any new and useful process,
machine, manufacture, or composition or matter, or any new and useful improvement
thereof." Therefore, a fundamental premise is that a patent is a statutorily created
vehicle for Congress to confer an exclusive right to the inventors for "inventions" that
promote the progress of "science and the useful arts". The phrase "technological arts"
has been created and used by the courts to offer another view of the term "useful arts".

See *In re Musgrave*, 167 USPQ (BNA) 280 (CCPA 1970). Hence, the first test of

Art Unit: 3622

whether an invention is eligible for a patent is to determine if the invention is within the "technological arts".

Further, despite the express language of §101, several judicially created exceptions have been established to exclude certain subject matter as being patentable subject matter covered by §101. These exceptions include "laws of nature", "natural phenomena", and "abstract ideas". See *Diamond v. Diehr*, 450, U.S. 175, 185, 209 USPQ (BNA) 1, 7 (1981). However, courts have found that even if an invention incorporates abstract ideas, such as mathematical algorithms, the invention may nevertheless be statutory subject matter if the invention as a whole produces a "useful, concrete and tangible result." See *State Street Bank & Trust Co. v. Signature Financial Group, Inc.* 149 F.3d 1368, 1973, 47 USPQ2d (BNA) 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1998).

This "two prong" test was evident when the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals (CCPA) decided an appeal from the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences (BPAI). See *In re Toma*, 197 USPQ (BNA) 852 (CCPA 1978). In *Toma*, the court held that the recited mathematical algorithm did not render the claim as a whole non-statutory using the Freeman-Walter-Abele test as applied to *Gottschalk v. Benson*, 409 U.S. 63, 175 USPQ (BNA) 673 (1972). Additionally, the court decided separately on the issue of the "technological arts". The court developed a "technological arts" analysis:

The "technological" or "useful" arts inquiry must focus on whether the claimed subject matter...is statutory, not on whether the product of the claimed subject matter...is statutory, not on whether the prior art which the claimed subject matter purports to replace...is statutory, and not on whether the claimed subject matter is presently perceived to be an improvement over the prior art, e.g., whether it

Art Unit: 3622

"enhances" the operation of a machine. *In re Toma* at 857.

In *Toma*, the claimed invention was a computer program for translating a source human language (e.g., Russian) into a target human language (e.g., English). The court found that the claimed computer implemented process was within the "technological art" because the claimed invention was an operation being performed by a computer within a computer.

The decision in State Street Bank & Trust Co. v. Signature Financial Group, Inc. never addressed this prong of the test. In State Street Bank & Trust Co., the court found that the "mathematical exception" using the Freeman-Walter-Abele test has little, if any, application to determining the presence of statutory subject matter but rather, statutory subject matter should be based on whether the operation produces a "useful." concrete and tangible result". See State Street Bank & Trust Co. at 1374. Furthermore, the court found that there was no "business method exception" since the court decisions that purported to create such exceptions were based on novelty or lack of enablement issues and not on statutory grounds. Therefore, the court held that "[w]hether the patent's claims are too broad to be patentable is not to be judged under §101, but rather under §§102, 103 and 112." See State Street Bank & Trust Co. at 1377. Both of these analysis goes towards whether the claimed invention is non-statutory because of the presence of an abstract idea. Indeed, State Street abolished the Freeman-Walter-Abele test used in Toma. However, State Street never addressed the second part of the analysis, i.e., the "technological arts" test established in Toma because the invention in

Art Unit: 3622

State Street (i.e., a computerized system for determining the year-end income, expense, and capital gain or loss for the portfolio) was already determined to be within the technological arts under the *Toma* test. This dichotomy has been recently acknowledged by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences (BPAI) in affirming a §101 rejection finding the claimed invention to be non-statutory. See *Ex parte Bowman*, 61 USPQ2d (BNA) 1669 (BdPatApp&Int 2001).

In the present application, claims 1 and 10 merely require defining objects, actions and selector for invoking them; no computer or computer processing is specified.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gerace (US5991735) in view of Taylor (Object-Oriented Information Systems).

Regarding claims 1, 8-10, 13-16, 21, Gerace provides a system which presents data to a requesting user. The provided data has customized content and formatting. Gerace achieves the methods using Object Oriented Programming (OOP) [2:10-30, 61-67]. Gerace lacks background on the principles and advantages of OOP. Taylor teaches basic features and advantages of Object Oriented Programming (OOP). Taylor

Art Unit: 3622

teaches that objects are defined for entities in the business system to be modeled. The objects have attributes and are associated with procedures/methods that carry out a business rules. Modules are programmed to represent different business functions which act on the objects and the associated methods (actions). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to have employed these OOP programming techniques for any business needs, including the customized data selection and presentment of Gerace. Applicant's selectors are met by programming modules or subroutines; actions are met by methods and classifiers and their classifications are met by objects and their attributes.

Regarding claims 2, 3, 17, 18, Taylor teaches that OOP is based on reuse of software components [pg 1], reuse tends to aid in development, debugging and maintenance.

Regarding claims 4, 5, 19, 20, Taylor teaches an integrated development environment that includes a class browser. This enables programmers to manage all of the software objects/components. Taylor describes a collapsible, hierarchical tree-like methods for managing the objects. When an object is highlighted, its methods are also highlighted. The tree-like browser enables a user to locate all classes in the system that call a particular method [pg 225-226]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to have used such a development environment for displaying the classifier objects, actions and selectors when designing the business application of Gerace.

Art Unit: 3622

Regarding claims 6, 7, the system of Gerace creates a use profile and the system selects customized content to present the user. This functionality inherently relies on both user data (profile) and the system data (raw content).

Regarding claims 11, 12, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to have provided programming that always defined an action, regardless of the user - such as putting a universal navigation menu on the user pages. Gerace teaches that if the user does not have an established profile (i.e. a new user), the system presents a generic start page [4:32-54]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to have programmed logic to display customized contents for recognized users and otherwise provide the generic content if not recognized.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey D. Carlson whose telephone number is 703-308-3402. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:30-6p, (off on alternate Fridays).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eric Stamber can be reached on 703-305-8469. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9326 for regular communications and 703-872-9327 for After Final communications.

Art Unit: 3622

1113.

Page 8

JUD CA

Jeffrey D. Carlson Primary Examiner Art Unit 3622

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or

proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-

jdc June 16, 2003